

Ordering-based Representations of Rational Inference*

Konstantinos Georgatos
 Dipartimento di Informatica e Sistemistica
 Università di Roma “La Sapienza”
 Via Salaria 113, Roma 00198
 Italy

February 7, 2008

Abstract

Rational inference relations were introduced by Lehmann and Magidor as the ideal systems for drawing conclusions from a conditional base. However, there has been no simple characterization of these relations, other than its original representation by preferential models. In this paper, we shall characterize them with a class of total preorders of formulas by improving and extending Gärdenfors and Makinson’s results for expectation inference relations. A second representation is application-oriented and is obtained by considering a class of consequence operators that grade sets of defaults according to our reliance on them. The finitary fragment of this class of consequence operators has been employed by recent default logic formalisms based on maxiconsistency.

Keywords: *foundations of knowledge representation, nonmonotonic reasoning, nonmonotonic consequence relations, orderings of formulas.*

1 Introduction

A recent breakthrough in nonmonotonic logic is the beginning of study of nonmonotonic consequence through postulates for abstract nonmonotonic consequence relations, using Gentzen-like context-sensitive sequents ([6], [14], [12]). The outcome of this research turns out to be valuable in at least two ways

- it provides a sufficiently general *axiomatic* framework for comparing and classifying nonmonotonic formalisms, and

*Work supported by Training through Research Contract No. ERBFMBICT950324 between the European Community and Università degli Studi di Roma “La Sapienza”.

- it gave rise to new, simpler, and better behaved systems for nonmonotonic reasoning, such as cumulative ([6]), preferential ([12]), and rational ([13]) inference relations.

It is unfortunate that these new inference relations enjoy only one, semantical, representation; that of preferential models ([24]). We have that *preferential*, *preferential transitive*, and *preferential modular* or *ranked* models characterize cumulative, preferential and rational inference relations, respectively ([12], [13]). An additional second-order constraint must be imposed on these models, called *stoppering* or *smoothness*. However, this modeling is insufficient because in order to employ the above inference relations, one must be able to generate them. This is crucial when we want to design a system that reasons using the above inference relations. In such a case, one comes up with a set of rules or defaults that one wants to apply, imposes a prioritization on them, and provides a mechanism which ensures that answers are derived according to these inference relations. This is exactly the proof-theoretic approach expressed by default logic. However, no similar proof-theoretic notion is provided in the above framework.

In this paper, we offer two new, alternative representations for rational inference. The first representation is algebraic and obtained through a simple class of orderings of formulas, called *rational* orderings. The second representation is proof-theoretic and obtained through a class of consequence operators based on the way we handle defaults, called *ranked consequence operators*. Moreover, a correspondence result between these classes is established.

The first link between nonmonotonic inference relations and a class of orderings of formulas was given by Gärdenfors and Makinson in [7]. However, the nonmonotonic system defined by an ordering of formulas is not one of the previously mentioned systems, but a translation of the well-known belief revision AGM axioms ([1]) into nonmonotonic reasoning, called *expectation* inference relations. Expectation inference relations are rational inference relations together with a rule called *Consistency Preservation*. Moreover, Gärdenfors and Makinson's representation of expectation inference relations with orderings of formulas is not appropriate, in the sense that the correspondence is not bijective. (Two orderings of formulas can generate the same inference relation.) So, two questions remain open. Namely,

- is there a way to generate one of the independently motivated nonmonotonic inference relations (cumulative, preferential, rational) with a class of orderings of formulas?, and
- can the correspondence be bijective?

We answer affirmatively both questions for rational inference. Our approach is the following. We study the rule of Consistency Preservation and, by giving it a precise syntactic characterization, show that its role is insignificant in the context of preferential reasoning. Drawing from this intuition, we introduce new

defining conditions relating the classes of orderings of formulas and nonmonotonic consequence relations and show that Gärdenfors-Makinson orderings are in bijective correspondence with rational inference. Moreover, we introduce a smaller class of orderings, which, under our translation, is in bijective correspondence with the Gärdenfors-Makinson expectation inference relations. This is how the first representation result for rational inference is obtained. This result adds to a long tradition of defining nonmonotonic logics with orderings of formulas ([4], [19], [7], [20]).

The above representation result is more “constructive” than the semantical completeness of preferential models. However, rational orderings must have a concise, constructive representation. To this end, we encode a natural way of applying defaults into a new class of consequence relations, called *ranked consequence operators*. Each member of this class generates a rational ordering, and conversely, hence the class of ranked consequence relations coincides with that of rational inference. Also, we show how previous default logic systems in the literature ([17], [18]) reduce to our framework.

The above results pave the way towards a study of nonmonotonicity through orderings of formulas, allow us to translate previous work in belief revision into the context of nonmonotonic reasoning, and provide a framework for designing default systems obeying rational inference.

The plan of this paper as follows. In Section 2, we briefly introduce the relations under study, explain the rule of Consistency Preservation, and provide a characterization for this rule. In Section 3, we introduce the orderings, their translations and our first representation theorem. In Section 4, we introduce ranked consequence operators and our second representation theorem. In Section 5, we show how one can generate a ranked consequence operator given a prioritized family of sets of defaults and, in Section 6, conclude. A preliminary version of the first half of this paper appeared in [10]. Results from the second half were announced in [9].

2 Shifting underlying entailment

Before going to the main result of this section, we shall make a brief introduction to the nonmonotonic consequence relations under study. Assume a language $\mathcal{L}$ of propositional constants closed under the boolean connectives $\vee$ (disjunction), $\wedge$ (conjunction), $\neg$ (negation) and $\rightarrow$ (implication). We shall use greek letters α, β, γ , etc. for propositional variables. We shall also use $\alpha \vdash \beta$, read as “ α normally entails β ”, to denote the nonmonotonic consequence relation ($\vdash \subseteq \mathcal{L} \times \mathcal{L}$). Before we present the first set of rules for $\vdash$, we need a symbol for a classical-like entailment. We shall use $\vdash$. The relation $\vdash$ need not be that of classical propositional logic. We require that $\vdash$ includes classical propositional logic, satisfies compactness (i.e., if $X \vdash \beta$ then there exists a finite subset Y of X such that $Y \vdash \beta$)¹, the deduction theorem (i.e., $X, \alpha \vdash \beta$ if and only if $X \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \beta$) and disjunction in premises (i.e., if $X, \alpha \vdash \beta$ and $X, \gamma \vdash \beta$ then $X, \alpha \vee \gamma \vdash \beta$).

¹We write $X, \alpha \vdash \beta$ for $X \cup \{\alpha\} \vdash \beta$.

Table 1: Rules for Preferential, Rational and Expectation Inference

$\frac{\alpha \vdash \beta}{\alpha \vdash \beta}$	(Supraclassicality)
$\frac{\alpha \vdash \beta \quad \beta \vdash \alpha \quad \alpha \vdash \gamma}{\beta \vdash \gamma}$	(Left Logical Equivalence)
$\frac{\alpha \vdash \beta \quad \vdash \beta \rightarrow \gamma}{\alpha \vdash \gamma}$	(Right Weakening)
$\frac{\alpha \vdash \beta \quad \alpha \vdash \gamma}{\alpha \vdash \beta \wedge \gamma}$	(And)
$\frac{\alpha \vdash \beta \quad \alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma}{\alpha \vdash \gamma}$	(Cut)
$\frac{\alpha \vdash \beta \quad \alpha \vdash \gamma}{\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma}$	(Cautious Monotonicity)
$\frac{\alpha \vdash \gamma \quad \beta \vdash \gamma}{\alpha \vee \beta \vdash \gamma}$	(Or)
$\frac{\alpha \not\vdash \neg \beta \quad \alpha \vdash \gamma}{\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma}$	(Rational Monotonicity)
$\frac{\alpha \vdash \perp}{\alpha \vdash \perp}$	(Consistency Preservation)

The reader will notice that these are the only properties we make use of in the subsequent proofs. We shall denote the consequences of α with $Cn(\alpha)$ and $C(\alpha)$ under $\vdash$ and $\vdash$, respectively.

The rules mentioned in the following are presented in Table 1. For a motivation of these rules, see [12] and [15]. (The latter serves as an excellent introduction to nonmonotonic consequence relations.)

Definition 1 Following ([12], [13], [7]), we shall say that a relation $\vdash$ on $\mathcal{L}$ is an *inference relation (based on $\vdash$)* if it satisfies Supraclassicality, Left Logical Equivalence, Right Weakening, and And. We shall call an inference relation $\vdash$ *preferential* if it satisfies, in addition, Cut, Cautious Monotonicity, and Or. We shall call an inference relation $\vdash$ *rational* if it is preferential and satisfies, in addition, Rational Monotonicity. Finally, we shall say that $\vdash$ is an *expectation inference relation (based on $\vdash$)* if it is a rational and satisfies, in addition, Consistency Preservation.

The most controversial of these rules is Rational Monotonicity, which, moreover, is non-Horn. For a plausible counterexample, see [26].

Expectation inference relations correspond to the so-called AGM postulates for belief revision ([1]), as it was shown in [16], and only differ from rational

relations in that they satisfy the following rule, called *Consistency Preservation*:

$$\frac{\alpha \vdash \perp}{\alpha \vdash \perp}$$

where $\vdash$ is classical entailment. Consistency Preservation says that a logically not false belief cannot render our set of beliefs inconsistent. This makes a difference between the two classes, in the following sense. Using rational inference, I can rely on an inference such as $\beta \vdash \perp$, where β is the statement “I am the Queen of England”. On the other hand, expectation inference would not allow that, since, even if I am certain I am not the Queen of England, one could think a world where I could have been. This becomes more important if, instead of a belief set, one considers a conditional base. For example, consider a database for air-traffic. The statement “two airplanes are scheduled to arrive at the same time and land on the same place” should infer inconsistency on this database, although it is not a falsity. More examples can be drawn from physical laws. This means that rational inference is the logic of “hard constraints”, that is of statements (not necessarily tautologies) I cannot revise without deconstructing the whole inference mechanism. This is not admitted in expectation inference: all statements are allowed to be revised apart from tautologies (or whatever is a consequence of the empty set under the underlying entailment).

In [16] and [15], it was observed that preferential entailment satisfies a weaker form of consistency preservation: there exists a consequence operation $\vdash'$ with $\vdash \subseteq \vdash' \subseteq \vdash$ such that $\vdash$ satisfies Consistency Preservation with respect to $\vdash'$. This was proved by semantical arguments.

In the following theorem, we make this property more precise by expressing it in syntactic terms. We show that the required underlying consequence operation retains the properties of the initial one, as it only differs on the set of assumptions. Therefore, the relation between an expectation and a rational inference relation is that of a logic with its theory.

For the proof of Theorem 3, we shall make use of the following rules (derived in any preferential inference relation).

Lemma 2 *In any preferential inference relation, the following rules hold*

1. $\frac{\alpha \vdash \beta \quad \beta \vdash \alpha \quad \alpha \vdash \gamma}{\beta \vdash \gamma}$ (Reciprocity)
2. $\frac{\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma}{\alpha \vdash \beta \rightarrow \gamma}$ (S)
3. $\frac{\alpha \vdash \perp}{\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \perp}$
4. $\frac{\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \perp}{\alpha \vdash \neg \beta}$

$$5. \frac{\alpha \vee \beta \vdash \perp}{\alpha \vdash \perp}$$

Proof. Rules 1, 2 and 3 were introduced and shown to be derived in a preferential relation in [12]. For 4, suppose $\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \perp$. Applying S, we get $\alpha \vdash \beta \rightarrow \perp$ and, by Right weakening, we conclude 4. For 5, suppose $\alpha \vee \beta \vdash \perp$. Then, by 3, we get $(\alpha \vee \beta) \wedge \alpha \vdash \perp$ and, by Left Logical Equivalence, we conclude 5. ■

Theorem 3 *Let $\vdash$ be a preferential inference relation based on $\vdash$. Then $\vdash$ is a preferential inference relation based on $\vdash'$ that satisfies the Consistency Preservation rule, where*

$$\alpha \vdash' \beta \quad \text{iff} \quad \Gamma, \alpha \vdash \beta,$$

and

$$\Gamma = \{\neg\gamma : \gamma \vdash \perp\}.$$

Proof. We must prove that $\vdash$ satisfies Supraclassicality, Left Logical Equivalence, Right Weakening and Consistency Preservation with respect to $\vdash'$. The rest of the rules are already satisfied since they do not involve an underlying consequence relation.

First notice that Consistency Preservation is immediate by definition of $\vdash'$.

For Supraclassicality, suppose $\alpha \vdash' \gamma$ then $\Gamma, \alpha \vdash \gamma$. By compactness of $\vdash$, there exist $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\beta_1 \vdash \perp, \dots, \beta_n \vdash \perp$ and $\neg\beta_1, \dots, \neg\beta_n, \alpha \vdash \gamma$. By repeated applications of Or, we get $\beta_1 \vee \dots \vee \beta_n \vdash \perp$. Let $\beta = \beta_1 \vee \dots \vee \beta_n$, then $\beta \vdash \perp$ and $\alpha \wedge \neg\beta \vdash \gamma$. By Supraclassicality of $\vdash$ on $\vdash$, we have $\alpha \wedge \neg\beta \vdash \gamma$. By Lemma 2.3, we have $\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \perp$, so, by Lemma 2.4, we have $\alpha \vdash \neg\beta$. Using Cut, we get $\alpha \vdash \gamma$, as desired.

For Left Logical Equivalence, suppose $\alpha \vdash \gamma$, $\alpha \vdash' \beta$, and $\beta \vdash' \alpha$, i.e. $\Gamma, \alpha \vdash \beta$ and $\Gamma, \beta \vdash \alpha$. By compactness, there exist $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\alpha \vdash \neg\delta_1$, $\alpha \vdash \neg\delta_2$, $\alpha \wedge \delta_1 \vdash \beta$, and $\beta \wedge \delta_2 \vdash \alpha$. As above, we have $\alpha \vdash \beta$ and $\beta \vdash \alpha$. Therefore, by Lemma 2.1, we get $\beta \vdash \gamma$, as desired.

Coming to Right Weakening, suppose $\alpha \vdash \beta$ and $\beta \vdash' \gamma$, i.e. there exists $\delta \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\alpha \vdash \neg\delta$ and $\beta \wedge \neg\delta \vdash \gamma$. By And, we have $\alpha \vdash \beta \wedge \neg\delta$, so, using Right Weakening of $\vdash$ on $\vdash$, we get $\alpha \vdash \gamma$, as desired. ■

Notice that the result applies to rational inference relations, as well, since the latter are preferential, by definition. We interpret the above result as follows. Once we strengthen the underlying entailment, rational inference will become an expectation inference and, therefore, can be treated as such. It also implies that the logic of hard and soft constraints is basically the same, their only difference being what we consider a consequence of the underlying propositional entailment. Hard constraints are just taking a place in our belief set as “guarded” as that of, say, tautologies. Whatever remains is subject to revision, and hence a soft constraint.

3 Rational inference and orderings

Now that we established the correspondence between rational and expectation inference relations, we shall extend it to a particularly attractive characterization of the latter with orderings of formulas. We shall first review Gärdenfors-Makinson's results and then present our own.

The intuition behind ordering-based formalisms is common in works on belief revision, possibilistic logic, and decision theory. We order sentences according to our expectations. A relation " $\alpha < \beta$ " is interpreted as " β is expected more than α ", or " α is more surprising than β ", or " β is more possible than α ". One can treat such an ordering as a primary notion; this is the approach of this paper. However, in case of rational orderings, one can show that such an ordering induces a function from the extensions of formulas to the unit interval. This function induces a *possibility* measure on the extensions of formulas (see [2]). A possibility measure is a "weak" probability measure on these extensions. Roughly, it replaces addition with maximisation. Although the connections with probability are not clear yet (see [3], [25]), probability measures seem especially suited for modeling cases under uncertainty. Further, a possibility measure arises naturally out of a database. Zadeh's theory for approximate reasoning ([28]) provides a method for turning available information of a certain form ("fuzzy" database) into a possibility measure and, therefore, gives rise to a rational ordering of sentences.

We find that, by a logical point of view, orderings correspond to prioritization. We prefer a proof-theoretic reading, made more explicit in Section 4, " α is more defeasible than β " or " α has lower priority than β ". A notion of proof is developed in Section 4 based on this prioritization and justifies the use of rational orderings without appealing to some probabilistic intuition.

Definition 4 [7] A *rational ordering* is a relation $\leq$ on $\mathcal{L}$ which satisfies the following properties:

1. If $\alpha \leq \beta$ and $\beta \leq \gamma$, then $\alpha \leq \gamma$ (Transitivity),
2. If $\alpha \vdash \beta$, then $\alpha \leq \beta$ (Dominance),
3. $\alpha \leq \alpha \wedge \beta$ or $\beta \leq \alpha \wedge \beta$ (Conjunctiveness).

The original name of these orderings was expectation orderings. However, we shall see that this name is not justifiable, since expectation inference relations correspond to a smaller class of orderings (see Definition 2).

One can easily derive from the above properties that a rational ordering satisfies

1. *connectivity*, i.e. $\alpha \leq \beta$ or $\beta \leq \alpha$, and
2. either $\alpha \leq \beta$, for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$, or $\neg\alpha \leq \beta$, for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$.

We should mention that the above properties of rational relations are not new. It is not easy to assign credits, but they have appeared in works in belief revision ([7]), possibilistic logic ([3], [4]), fuzzy logic ([27]), theory of evidence ([23]), and economics ([22]) (see [7] for a historical reference).

Gärdenfors and Makinson define the following maps between the class of expectation inference relations and rational orderings.

Definition 5 [7] Given a rational ordering $\leq$ and an expectation inference relation $\vdash$, then define a consequence relation $\vdash'$ and an ordering $\leq'$ as follows

- (C) $\alpha \vdash' \gamma$ iff either $\alpha \vdash \gamma$
or there is a $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma$ and $\neg\alpha < \beta$.
(O) $\alpha \leq' \beta$ iff either $\vdash \alpha \wedge \beta$ or $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \not\vdash \alpha$.

We shall also denote $\vdash'$ and $\leq'$ with $C(\leq)$ and $O(\vdash)$, respectively.

Condition (O) is critical and due to Rott ([21]). Now, one can prove the following.

Theorem 6 [7] *Given a rational ordering $\leq$ and an expectation inference relation $\vdash$, then $C(\leq)$ is an expectation inference relation and $O(\vdash)$ is a rational ordering. Moreover, we have $\vdash = C(O(\vdash))$.*

This theorem, although it exhibits the first connection between some class of nonmonotonic consequence relations and orderings of formulas, has two disadvantages. First, the way it achieves consistency preservation is ad hoc. If that was not the case, then the condition (C) would be inappropriate, since, in the first part, it refers explicitly to the underlying entailment². Second, it fails to show an isomorphism between the class of expectation inference relations and that of rational orderings, that is $\leq = O(C(\leq))$. If the second was not the case, then the condition (O) would use only the expectation inference relation to construct the ordering. Consider the following example.

Example 7 Let $\mathcal{D}_1 = \{\{\top\}, \{\top, \alpha\}\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_2 = \{\{\alpha\}\}$. Now define orderings on $\mathcal{L}$ as follows

$$\beta \leq_1 \gamma \text{ iff } A \vdash \beta \text{ implies } A \vdash \gamma, \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{D}_1.$$

Similarly, for $\mathcal{D}_2$ and $\leq_2$. We have that $\leq_1 \neq \leq_2$, and by Proposition 19, the orderings are rational. However, they generate the same expectation inference relation, using (O).

Drawing from the above intuitions and Theorem 3, we define

Definition 8 Given a rational ordering $\leq$ and a rational inference relation $\vdash$, then define a consequence relation $\vdash'$ and an ordering $\leq'$ as follows

- (C) $\alpha \vdash' \gamma$ iff either $\beta \leq \neg\alpha$, for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$,
or there is a $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma$ and $\neg\alpha < \beta$.
(O) $\alpha \leq' \beta$ iff either $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \vdash \perp$ or $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \not\vdash \alpha$.

We shall also denote $\vdash'$ and $\leq'$ with $\mathbf{C}(\leq)$ and $\mathbf{O}(\vdash)$, respectively.

For Theorem 10, we need the following lemma.

²However, the second part should remain the same since we do not mind having a few more consequences, as long as, the rules which govern the underlying entailment do not change.

Lemma 9 *Let $\leq$ and $\vdash$ be a rational ordering and inference relation, respectively. Then*

1. *If $\alpha \vdash \perp$ then $\beta \leq' \neg\alpha$, for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$, where $\leq' = \mathbf{O}(\vdash)$.*
2. *If $\beta \leq \neg\alpha$, for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$, then $\alpha \vdash' \perp$, where $\vdash' = \mathbf{C}(\leq)$.*
3. *$\neg\alpha < \alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ iff $\{\beta : \neg\alpha < \beta\} \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \gamma$.*

Now, everything falls into place.

Theorem 10 *Given a rational ordering $\leq$ and a rational inference relation $\vdash$, then $\mathbf{C}(\leq)$ is a rational inference relation and $\mathbf{O}(\vdash)$ is a rational ordering. Moreover, we have $\vdash = \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{O}(\vdash))$ and $\leq = \mathbf{O}(\mathbf{C}(\leq))$.*

Now, if rational orderings are in adjunction with rational inference relations, what is the class of orderings which corresponds to expectation inference relations? For that, observe that by Lemma 9, hard constraints are positioned on the top of rational orderings. So, it is enough to keep exclusively this place for the consequences of the empty set and add this as a condition to rational orderings.

Definition 11 *An expectation ordering is a rational ordering which satisfies, in addition, the following property:*

If $\beta \leq \alpha$, for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$, then $\vdash \alpha$.

Now, using the *same* defining conditions (**C**) and (**O**), we can state the improved characterization theorem for expectation inference relations.

Theorem 12 *Given an expectation ordering $\leq$ and an expectation inference relation $\vdash$, then $\mathbf{C}(\leq)$ is an expectation inference relation and $\mathbf{O}(\vdash)$ is an expectation ordering. Moreover, we have $\vdash = \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{O}(\vdash))$ and $\leq = \mathbf{O}(\mathbf{C}(\leq))$.*

Theorems 10 and 12 can now be used for giving new straightforward proofs for the characterization of rational inference with ranked preferential models (Theorem 3.12 of [13]) and expectation inference with nice preferential models (Theorems 3.8 and 3.9 of [7]). These proofs will appear elsewhere.

4 Ranked consequence operators

First, a word about the plan of this section. We introduce the notion of ranked consequence operation without referring to an underlying entailment (Definition 4). The reason for such a definition is that we can motivate ranked consequence operators independently of nonmonotonic reasoning. Then we define a smaller class based on an underlying entailment (Definition 4) and show that this class characterize rational inference relations. The same constraints we

assumed for a language $\mathcal{L}$ and an entailment $\vdash$ in Section 2 continue to hold here.

Think of a reasoner whose beliefs are ordered accordingly to their defeasibility. Beliefs which are less likely to be defeated come before beliefs which are more likely to be defeated. For instance “Birds fly” will come after “Penguins do not fly” (since the former has more exceptions) and “Mary is married” might come before “Mary is married with children” (since the latter is stronger). There is a natural way to attach a consequence operator to this belief prioritization.

Definition 13 Let $\langle I, < \rangle$ be a linear ordering, and $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ be an upward chain of sets of formulas such that $A_i \subseteq A_j$ iff $i \leq j$. Define the following consequence operators (one for each $i \in I$):

$$\begin{array}{lll} \vdash_i \beta & \text{iff} & \beta \in A_i, \\ \alpha \vdash_i \beta & \text{iff} & \neg \alpha \notin A_i \text{ and } \alpha \rightarrow \beta \in A_i. \end{array}$$

Now let

$$\alpha \vdash \beta \quad \text{iff} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{either } \alpha \vdash_i \beta, \text{ for some } i \in I, \\ \text{or } \vdash_i \neg \alpha, \text{ for all } i \in I. \end{array}$$

The consequence operator $\vdash$ will be called *ranked consequence operator* (induced by $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$).

First, note that A_i ’s are *not* necessarily deductively closed. Second, notice that, unless we add the last part of the definition of $\vdash$, we do not provide for formulas α , where $\neg \alpha \in A_i$, for all $i \in I$. In order to have $\alpha \vdash \perp$, there must either be an A_i such that $\neg \alpha \notin A_i$ and $\alpha \rightarrow \perp \in A_i$, or $\neg \alpha \in A_i$, for all $i \in I$. This means that if our beliefs can accommodate a context where α holds, then we use the part of the ordering that remains consistent after adding α . Therefore the A_i ’s which contain both $\neg \alpha$ and α are irrelevant to the consequence operator.

Indices assign grades of relying on the set of consequences as the next example, formalizing omniscience, shows.

Example 14 Let $\langle \omega, < \rangle$ be the set of natural numbers with the usual order. Now let $\vdash$ be the classical consequence relation and let A_1 be some set of formulas of propositional logic. Let

$$A_2 = \{\phi \mid \text{is provable in one step from } A_1\},$$

and, inductively,

$$A_n = \{\phi \mid \text{is provable in less than } n - 1 \text{ steps from } A_1\}.$$

Notice that if A_1 is consistent and $\vdash$ is the ranked consequence operator defined through $\{A_i\}_{i \in \omega}$ then

$$\alpha \vdash \beta \quad \text{iff} \quad A_1, \alpha \vdash \beta,$$

where $\vdash$ is the classical consequence operator of propositional calculus. Note that if A_1 is inconsistent, then α entails all formulas which are provable from A_1 with less steps than $\neg\alpha$, i.e., before we realize inconsistency. Now, if A_1 is the set of all tautologies or, better, an axiomatization of them then $\vdash$ is exactly the classical consequence operator.

It is clear that the above representation is syntax-based, i.e. depends on the particular representation of A_i 's. The case where the sets of formulas A_i are closed under consequence is the one we shall deal with in this paper. Doing that is like being logically omniscient; we do not assign any cost to derivations using $\vdash$.

We shall now give a definition of ranked consequence operator using an underlying entailment. In case the A_i 's are closed under consequence, it coincides with the original definition (by replacing the set belonging relation $\in$ with proposition entailment $\vdash$).

Definition 15 A ranked consequence operator $\vdash$ based on $\vdash$ induced by a chain of sets $\{B_i\}_{i \in I}$ under inclusion is defined as follows:

We first define a set of consequence operators $\vdash_i$ (one for each $i \in I$):

$$\alpha \vdash_i \beta \quad \text{iff} \quad B_i \not\vdash \neg\alpha \text{ and } B_i, \alpha \vdash \beta.$$

Note that we denote $\top \vdash_i \beta$ with $\vdash_i \beta$. We can now let

$$\alpha \vdash \beta \quad \text{iff} \quad \begin{array}{l} \text{either } \alpha \vdash_i \beta, \text{ for some } i \in I, \\ \text{or } \vdash_i \neg\alpha, \text{ for all } i \in I. \end{array}$$

We shall use $\langle \{B_i\}_{i \in I}, \vdash \rangle$ to denote this operator.

Notice that we can have both $\not\vdash \alpha$ and $\vdash_i \neg\alpha$, for all i . This translates to the fact that α can be true in some possible world but it is unthinkable for us to include it in our beliefs. The above mechanism treats such a case as an instance of a *hard* constraint: such an α implies falsehood.

Again notice that unless $B_i \vdash \neg\alpha$, for all $i \in I$, we cannot derive falsity from α . The reason is that, in those cases, we are able to form a context based on α (a chain of sets of formulas which prove α) which is consistent. Again, the inconsistent B_i 's are irrelevant to the consequence operator. The following proposition allows us to assume that the ordering is complete, that is it has all meets and joins, and amounts essentially to Lewis' assumption or smoothness property of preferential models.

Proposition 16 A ranked consequence operator $\vdash$ based on $\vdash$ is induced by a chain of sets of formulas if and only if it is induced by the closure of this chain under arbitrary unions and intersections.

This result has the following significance: it allows an assignment of a rank to an assertion of the form $\alpha \vdash \beta$. Suppose that $\alpha \vdash \beta$ holds. If $\vdash_i \neg\alpha$ for all $i \in I$ does not hold, then the set $I_{\alpha \vdash \beta} = \{i : \not\vdash_i \neg\alpha \text{ and } \alpha \vdash_i \beta\}$ is not empty. Moreover, it is connected. Now, it is easy to see that, in the completion of the

chain, this set has a least element (because it is closed under intersection) and a greatest element (because it is closed under unions). Let i_1 and i_2 be the indices of the least and greatest elements, respectively. The *rank* of the assertion $\alpha \sim \beta$ is i_1 and its *range* $[i_1, i_2]$. In case $\vdash_i \neg\alpha$, for all $i \in I$, then set the rank of $\alpha \sim \beta$ to 0 and its range to $[0, l]$, where 0 and l are the indices of least and the greatest element of the linear order, respectively. In case of an assertion $\vdash \beta$, observe that its range is of the form $[i, l]$, where l is the index of the greatest element of the linear ordering.

Finally, notice that a ranked consequence operator is not necessarily monotonic.

Example 17 Let $B_1 = \{\alpha\}$ and $B_2 = \{\alpha, \neg\beta\}$. We have $\alpha \sim \neg\beta$ because $\neg\alpha \notin Cn(B_2)$ and $\alpha \rightarrow \neg\beta \in Cn(B_2)$. But we also have that $\alpha \wedge \beta \not\sim \neg\beta$ because $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \notin Cn(B_1)$.

Now, it is interesting to ask what kind of properties a ranked consequence operator satisfies. It turns out that each ranked consequence operator gives rise to a rational inference relation. Although one can show it directly, we define the rational orderings induced by such operators.

Definition 18 Given a ranked consequence operator, let

$$\alpha \leq \beta \quad \text{iff} \quad B_i \vdash \alpha \text{ implies } B_i \vdash \beta, \text{ for all } i \in I.$$

and call $\leq$ the *ordering induced by the ranked consequence operator* $\vdash$.

We, now, have the following

Proposition 19 *An ordering induced by a ranked consequence operator is rational. Moreover, $\mathbf{C}(\leq) = \vdash$.*

We have immediately the following.

Corollary 20 *A ranked consequence operator is a rational inference relation.*

The other direction of the above theorem holds, too. We should only show, given a rational ordering, how to generate a total order of sets of formulas. To this end, we shall define a chain of sets $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ which generates a ranked consequence operator $\vdash$ equal to $\mathbf{C}(\leq)$. Let $\sim$ be the equivalence relation induced by $\leq$ (a rational ordering is a preorder). The equivalence classes will be denoted by $\hat{\alpha}$ (where $\alpha \in \hat{\alpha}$). It is also clear that the set of equivalence classes is linearly ordered. Now, for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}$, let

$$A_{\hat{\alpha}} = \{\beta : \alpha \leq \beta\}.$$

Note here that, by Dominance, the sets $A_{\hat{\alpha}}$ are closed under consequence. Moreover, we have $A_{\hat{\alpha}} \subseteq A_{\hat{\beta}}$ iff $\beta \leq \alpha$. Now, generate a ranked consequence operator $\vdash$ as in Definition 4. This ranked consequence operator turns out to be equal to the one generated by the rational order. So, we have the following.

Theorem 21 *A rational inference relation is a ranked consequence operator.*

The proof of the above theorem shows that a rational ordering can be defined by a chain of sets which induces a ranked consequence operator and conversely. However, the same rational ordering can be induced by two different ranked consequence operators. This should hardly be surprising, as ranked consequence operators play the role of axiomatizing a nonmonotonic “theory”, that is, a rational inference. Moreover,

- ranked consequence operators are proof-theoretic in their motivation, and therefore closer to what we want to describe by a rational inference relation, and
- a ranked consequence operator assigns ranks to assertions as well as to formulas therefore grading the whole process of inference.

We showed that rational and expectation inference relations are exactly the same class of consequence relations if we allow the underlying propositional entailment to “vary”. However fixing $\vdash$, is it possible to tell if a ranked consequence operator satisfies Consistency Preservation? The answer is affirmative, for a formula α infers inconsistency ($\alpha \vdash \perp$) if and only if its negation is a consequence of the first element of the chain which induces the ranked consequence operator (as a corollary of Proposition 16, a first element always exists). To see that, suppose $\alpha \vdash \perp$, then, by definition, we must have $\vdash_i \neg\alpha$, for all $i \in I$, and for that it is enough that the first element of the chain implies $\neg\alpha$.

5 Rational default systems

In this section, we shall see how one can design a ranked consequence operator. Suppose we are given a number of sets of (normal, without prerequisites) defaults in a linear *well-founded* prioritization. Moreover, and this is an important assumption for rational inference, we are asked to, either apply the whole set, or not apply it at all. Let the set of sets of defaults be $\mathcal{D} = \{A_i\}_{i \in I}$, where $\langle I, < \rangle$ is a well-founded linear strict order, and A_i is preferred from A_j whenever $i < j$. There are two ways to read this preference.

- The first way is a *strict* one: if you cannot add A_i to your set of theorems (that is, you derive inconsistency by adding A_i) then you cannot add A_j , for all A_j less preferred from A_i .
- the other is *liberal*: if you cannot add A_i to your set of theorems, then you can add A_j , where A_j is less preferred from A_i , *provided* you cannot add A_k , where A_k is more preferred than A_j .

To illustrate this, consider the following example.

Example 22 Let $\mathcal{D} = \{A_1, A_2, A_3\}$, where $A_1 = \{\alpha \rightarrow \beta\}$, $A_2 = \{\neg\beta\}$, and $A_3 = \{\beta \rightarrow \gamma\}$. Assume α . Following the strict interpretation, we can only

infer β , from A_1 . With the liberal interpretation, we can also infer γ , since we are allowed to add A_3 , and cannot add A_2 that leads to a contradiction.

It turns out that those readings are equivalent. Not in the sense that the *same* set of sets of defaults generate the same consequences, but that a strict extension of a family of sets of defaults can be reduced to a liberal extension of another family of sets of defaults, and conversely. It can be easily shown that strict and liberal extensions of families of sets of defaults are instances of rational consequence operators and, therefore, rational. In particular, Proposition 19 gives us a way to construct the rational orderings of such default systems.

Given $\mathcal{D} = \{A_i\}_{i \in I}$, where $\langle I, < \rangle$ is well-founded, define the following strict ordering between non-empty subsets of I :

$$K < L \quad \text{iff} \quad \text{there exists } i \in I \text{ such that} \quad \begin{array}{ll} \text{a. } i \in K \text{ but } i \notin L, \text{ and} \\ \text{b. for all } j < i, j \in K \text{ iff } j \in L. \end{array}$$

It can be shown that $<$ is linear. Now, let $A_K = \bigcap_{K \leq L} Cn(\bigcup_{i \in L} A_i)$.

Definition 23 Let $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{D} = \{A_i\}_{i \in I}$, where $\langle I, < \rangle$ is a total strict order, and $A_i \subseteq \mathcal{L}$, for all $i \in I$. The *strict extension* $E_{\mathcal{D}}^s(\alpha)$ of α with respect to $\mathcal{D}$ is defined as follows

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}^s(\alpha) = \bigcup \{E_i^s : E_i^s \text{ is consistent}\},$$

where $E_i^s = Cn(\{\alpha\} \cup \bigcup_{j \leq i} A_j)$. The *liberal extension* $E_{\mathcal{D}}^l(\alpha)$ of α with respect to $\mathcal{D}$ is defined as follows

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}^l(\alpha) = \bigcup \{E_L^l : E_L^l \text{ is consistent}\},$$

where $E_L^l = Cn(\{\alpha\} \cup \bigcup_{K \leq L} A_K)$.

Thus the liberal extension of $\mathcal{D} = \{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ is the strict extension of $\mathcal{D}' = \{A_K\}_{K \in \mathcal{P}(I)^*}$. For the other direction, the strict extension of $\mathcal{D} = \{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ coincides with the liberal extension of $\mathcal{D}'' = \{C_i\}_{i \in I}$, where $C_i = \bigcup_{j \leq i} A_j$.

So, it is enough to construct the ranked consequence operator for the strict extension of $\mathcal{D} = \{A_i\}_{i \in I}$. But this is easily achieved. Consider $\langle \{B_i\}_{i \in I}, \vdash \rangle$, where $B_i = E_i^s$.

Thus, strict and liberal extensions of prioritized sets of set of formulas are rational. The above definition, together with Proposition 19, gives us a way to construct the rational orderings of such default systems. Given a prioritized set $\mathcal{D} = \{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ then the rational ordering of its strict extension is

$$\alpha \leq_{\mathcal{D}}^s \beta \quad \text{iff} \quad \bigcup_{j \leq i} A_j \vdash \alpha \text{ implies } \bigcup_{j \leq i} A_j \vdash \beta, \text{ for all } i \in I.$$

The rational ordering of its liberal extension is

$$\alpha \leq_{\mathcal{D}}^l \beta \quad \text{iff} \quad \bigcup_{K \leq L} A_K \vdash \alpha \text{ implies } \bigcup_{K \leq L} A_K \vdash \beta, \text{ for all } L \in \mathcal{P}(I)^*.$$

Assuming a finite language, sets of formulas, intersections, and unions of them correspond to conjunctions, disjunctions, and conjunctions, respectively.

A study of the above default systems under the assumption of finite language, has been carried already in the context of belief revision (therefore, assuming consistency preservation, in addition to finite language), by Nebel ([17], [18]). Our strict and liberal extensions are called *prioritized* and *linear base revision*, respectively. Also, Nebel showed in [18] that deciding if a certain formula is contained in the strict or in a liberal extension (that is, deciding $\alpha \vdash \beta$) is $\text{P}^{\text{NP}}[O(\log^c n)]$ and $\text{P}^{\text{NP}}[O(n)]$, respectively. We expect that these results carry over to our framework.

6 Conclusion

We summarize our results in the following

Theorem 24 *Let $\vdash$ be a binary relation on $\mathcal{L}$. Then the following are equivalent:*

1. *$\vdash$ is a rational inference relation, i.e. it satisfies Supraclassicality, Left Logical Equivalence, Right Weakening, And, Cut, Cautious Monotonicity, Or, and Rational Monotonicity.*
2. *$\vdash$ is characterized by some rational relation $\leq$ on $\mathcal{L}$ using condition (C).*
3. *$\vdash$ is defined by a ranked consequence operator.*

Since rational orderings are in one-to-one correspondence with rational inference, our first representation result has many ramifications. Results in belief revision can be translated in a nonmonotonic framework and vice versa. For instance, selection functions and preferential models can be used for the modeling of both. Proofs of this results are straightforward through our defining conditions for rational and expectation orderings. Work that has already been done on expectation inference relations (e.g. the study of generating expectation inference relations through incomplete rational orderings—see [5]) can be lifted smoothly to rational inference.

Our second representation result reveals the working mechanism of rational inference. It shows that, in order to attain rational inference, we must prioritize defaults in a particular way. We showed how default logic formalisms can fit this pattern. It enables us to assign grades to all components of the reasoning system (formulas and rules). Therefore, it is a particular attractive way to use it as an inference mechanism for nonmonotonic reasoning.

The above characterization results reveal another notion of consequence paradigm hidden behind nonmonotonicity. However, apart from Dubois and Prade's work on possibility logic, this paradigm has been passed largely unrecognized by logicians as an appropriate method for a treatment of vagueness and uncertainty. Yet, this paradigm arose independently from various studies on different fields and appeared before nonmonotonic logic. In addition, it is applicable. Now, an important question arises: how far this paradigm extends. In other words, is it possible to reduce a nonmonotonic consequence relation

to some relation expressing prioritization? The answer is positive and uniform. The important case of preferential consequence relations is treated separately in [8], while the general case (which includes cumulative consequence relations) appears in [11].

Acknowledgements: I would like to thank Gianni Amati and R. Ramanujam for their helpful comments on a preliminary version of this paper.

References

- [1] C. E. Alchourrón, Peter Gärdenfors, and David Makinson. On the logic of theory change: partial meet contraction and revision functions. *Journal of Symbolic Logic*, 50:510–530, 1985.
- [2] D. Dubois. Belief structures, possibility theory and decomposable confidence measures on finite sets. *Computers and Artificial Intelligence*, 5(5):403–416, 1986.
- [3] D. Dubois and H. Prade. *Possibility Theory: An Approach to Computerized Processing of Uncertainty*. Plenum, New York, 1988.
- [4] D. Dubois and H. Prade. Epistemic entrenchment and possibilistic logic. *Artificial Intelligence*, 50:223–239, 1991.
- [5] Luis Farinàs del Cerro, Andreas Herzig, and Jérôme Lang. From ordering-based nonmonotonic reasoning to conditional logics. *Artificial Intelligence*, 66:375–393, 1994.
- [6] Dov Gabbay. Theoretical foundations for nonmonotonic reasoning in expert systems. In K. Apt, editor, *Logics and Models of Concurrent Systems*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1985.
- [7] Peter Gärdenfors and David Makinson. Nonmonotonic inference based on expectations. *Artificial Intelligence*, 65:197–245, 1994.
- [8] Konstantinos Georgatos. Preferential orderings. Typed Manuscript. July 1995.
- [9] Konstantinos Georgatos. Default logic and nonmonotonic consequence relations (abstract). In *10th International Congress of Logic, Methodology and Philosophy of Science*, page 97, Florence, Italy, 1995.
- [10] Konstantinos Georgatos. On the relations between rational and expectation inference. Technical Report IMSc 95/3, Institute of Mathematical Sciences, Madras, India, February 1995.
- [11] Konstantinos Georgatos. Expectation relations: A uniform approach to nonmonotonicity. Working Paper 35–96, Dipartimento di Informatica e Sistemistica, Università di Roma “La Sapienza”, November 1996.
- [12] S. Kraus, Daniel Lehmann, and Menachem Magidor. Nonmonotonic reasoning, preferential models and cumulative logics. *Artificial Intelligence*, 44:167–207, 1990.
- [13] Daniel Lehmann and Menachem Magidor. What does a conditional knowledge base entail? *Artificial Intelligence*, 55:1–60, 1992.

- [14] David Makinson. General theory of cumulative inference. In M. Reinfrank, editor, *Non-Monotoning Reasoning*, number 346 in Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence, pages 1–18. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1989.
- [15] David Makinson. General patterns in nonmonotonic reasoning. In Dov Gabbay, C. Hogger, and Robinson, editors, *Handbook of Logic in Artificial Intelligence and Logic Programming*, volume III, pages 35–110. Oxford University Press, 1994.
- [16] David Makinson and Peter Gärdenfors. Relations between the logic of theory change and nonmonotonic logic. In A. Fuhrmann and M. Morreau, editors, *The Logic of Theory Change*, number 465 in Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence, pages 185–205, Berlin, 1991. Springer-Verlag.
- [17] Bernhard Nebel. Belief revision and default reasoning: Syntax based approaches. In J. A. Allen, R. Fikes, J. R. Levesque, and R. Reiter, editors, *Proceedings of The Second International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning (KR 91)*, pages 301–311. Morgan Kaufmann, 1991.
- [18] Bernhard Nebel. Base revision operations and schemes: Semantics, representation, and complexity. In A. Cohn, editor, *Proceedings of The 11th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence (ECAI 94)*, pages 341–345. John Wiley, 1994.
- [19] Judea Pearl. *Probabilistic Reasoning in Intelligent Systems*. Morgan Kaufmann, Los Altos, California, 1988.
- [20] H. Rott. A nonmonotonic conditional logic for belief revision. In A. Fuhrmann and M. Morreau, editors, *The Logic of Theory Change*, number 465 in Lecture Notes in Artificial Intelligence, pages 135–183, Berlin, 1991. Springer-Verlag.
- [21] H. Rott. Two methods of constructing contractions and revisions of knowledge systems. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 20:149–173, 1991.
- [22] G.L.S. Shackle. *Decision, Order and Time in Human Affairs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1961.
- [23] G. Shafer. *A Mathematical Theory of Evidence*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1976.
- [24] Y. Shoham. A semantical approach to non-monotonic logics. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 1413–1419, 1987.
- [25] W. Spohn. Ordinal conditional functions: A dynamic theory of epistemic states. In W. L. Harper and B. Skyrms, editors, *Causation in Decision, Belief Change, and Statistics*, volume 2, pages 105–134. D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht, Holland, 1987.

- [26] Robert Stalnaker. What is a nonmonotonic consequence relation? *Fundamenta Informaticae*, 21:7–21, 1994.
- [27] L. A. Zadeh. Fuzzy sets as a basis for a theory of possibility. *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, 1:3–28, 1978.
- [28] L. A. Zadeh. PRUF: A meaning representation language for natural languages. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 10(4):395–460, 1978.

A Proofs

For the proof of Theorem 3, we shall make use of the following rules (derived in any preferential inference relation).

Lemma 2 *In any preferential inference relation, the following rules hold*

1. $\frac{\alpha \vdash \beta \quad \beta \vdash \alpha \quad \alpha \vdash \gamma}{\beta \vdash \gamma} \text{ (Reciprocity)}$
2. $\frac{\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma}{\alpha \vdash \beta \rightarrow \gamma} \text{ (S)}$
3. $\frac{\alpha \vdash \perp}{\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \perp}$
4. $\frac{\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \perp}{\alpha \vdash \neg \beta}$
5. $\frac{\alpha \vee \beta \vdash \perp}{\alpha \vdash \perp}$

Proof. Rules 1, 2 and 3 were introduced and showed to be derived in a preferential relation in [12]. For 4, suppose $\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \perp$. Applying S, we get $\alpha \vdash \beta \rightarrow \perp$, and, by Right Weakening, we conclude 4. For 5, suppose $\alpha \vee \beta \vdash \perp$. Then, by 3, we get $(\alpha \vee \beta) \wedge \alpha \vdash \perp$, and, by Left Logical Equivalence, we conclude 5. ■

Theorem 3 *Let $\vdash$ be a preferential inference relation based on $\vdash$. Then $\vdash$ is a preferential inference relation based on $\vdash'$ that satisfies the Consistency Preservation rule, where*

$$\alpha \vdash' \beta \quad \text{iff} \quad \Gamma, \alpha \vdash \beta,$$

and

$$\Gamma = \{\neg \gamma : \gamma \vdash \perp\}.$$

Proof. We must prove that $\vdash$ satisfies Supraclassicality, Left Logical Equivalence, Right Weakening and Consistency Preservation with respect to $\vdash'$. The rest of the properties are already satisfied since $\vdash$ is a rational inference relation.

First notice that Consistency Preservation is immediate by definition of $\vdash'$.

For Supraclassicality, suppose $\alpha \vdash' \gamma$ then $\Gamma, \alpha \vdash \gamma$. By compactness of $\vdash$, there exists $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\beta_1 \vdash \perp, \dots, \beta_n \vdash \perp$ and $\neg \beta_1, \dots, \neg \beta_n, \alpha \vdash \gamma$. By repeated applications of Or, we get $\beta_1 \vee \dots \vee \beta_n \vdash \perp$. Let $\beta = \beta_1 \vee \dots \vee \beta_n$, then $\beta \vdash \perp$ and $\alpha \wedge \neg \beta \vdash \gamma$. By Supraclassicality of $\vdash$ on $\vdash$ we have $\alpha \wedge \neg \beta \vdash \gamma$. By Lemma 2.3, we have $\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \perp$, so, by Lemma 2.4, we have $\alpha \vdash \neg \beta$. Using Cut, we get $\alpha \vdash \gamma$.

For Left Logical Equivalence, suppose $\alpha \vdash \gamma$, $\alpha \vdash' \beta$ and $\beta \vdash' \alpha$, i.e. $\Gamma, \alpha \vdash \beta$ and $\Gamma, \beta \vdash \alpha$. By compactness there exist $\delta_1, \delta_2 \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\alpha \vdash \neg \delta_1$, $\alpha \vdash \neg \delta_2$,

$\alpha \wedge \delta_1 \vdash \beta$ and $\beta \wedge \delta_2 \vdash \alpha$. As above we have $\alpha \vdash \beta$ and $\beta \vdash \alpha$. Therefore by Lemma 2.1 we get $\beta \vdash \gamma$.

Coming to Right Weakening, suppose $\alpha \vdash \beta$ and $\beta \vdash' \gamma$, i.e. there exists $\delta \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\alpha \vdash \neg\delta$ and $\beta \wedge \neg\delta \vdash \gamma$. By And we have $\alpha \vdash \beta \wedge \neg\delta$, so using Right Weakening of $\vdash$ on $\vdash$ we get $\alpha \vdash \gamma$. ■

For Theorem 10, we shall need the following lemma.

Lemma 9 *Let $\leq$ and $\vdash$ be a rational ordering and inference relation, respectively. Then*

1. *If $\alpha \vdash \perp$ then $\beta \leq' \neg\alpha$, for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$, where $\leq' = \mathbf{O}(\vdash)$.*
2. *If $\beta \leq \neg\alpha$, for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$, then $\alpha \vdash' \perp$, where $\vdash' = \mathbf{C}(\leq)$.*
3. *$\neg\alpha < \alpha \rightarrow \gamma$ iff $\{\beta : \neg\alpha < \beta\} \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \gamma$.*
4. *If $\alpha \vdash' \perp$ then $\beta \leq \neg\alpha$, for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$, where $\vdash' = \mathbf{C}(\leq)$.*
5. *If $\beta \leq' \neg\alpha$, for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$, then $\alpha \vdash \perp$, where $\leq' = \mathbf{O}(\vdash)$.*

Proof. Part 2 is immediate from defining condition (C). For Part 1, suppose that $\neg(\neg\alpha \wedge \beta) \vdash \beta$. We must show $\neg(\neg\alpha \wedge \beta) \vdash \perp$. Since $\alpha \vdash \perp$, we have $\alpha \vdash \neg\beta$, by Right Weakening. Applying Or, we get $\alpha \vee \neg\beta \vdash \neg\beta$. By hypothesis and And, we get $\neg(\neg\alpha \wedge \beta) \vdash \perp$.

The left to right direction of Part 3 is straightforward. For the right to left direction, suppose $\{\beta : \neg\alpha < \beta\} \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \gamma$. Then, by Compactness, there exist $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n$ such that $\neg\alpha < \beta_i$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, and $\beta_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \beta_n \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \gamma$. By Conjunctiveness, we have $\neg\alpha < \beta_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \beta_n$. So, by Dominance, we have $\beta_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \beta_n \leq \alpha \rightarrow \gamma$. Hence, by Transitivity, $\neg\alpha < \alpha \rightarrow \gamma$, as desired.

For Part 4, we have, by definition of $\vdash'$ that $\beta \leq \neg\alpha$, for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}$ or there is $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \perp$ and $\neg\alpha < \beta$. If the former holds then the result follows immediately. If the latter holds then $\beta \vdash \neg\alpha$ that contradicts $\neg\alpha < \beta$, by Dominance. ■ Do Part 5

Lemma 25 *Let $\leq$ and $\vdash$ be a rational ordering and inference relation, respectively. Then*

1. *$\neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta \vdash \neg\alpha$ implies $\alpha \leq' \beta$, where $\leq' = \mathbf{O}(\vdash)$.*
2. *$\alpha \vdash' \beta$ implies $\neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta \leq \neg\alpha$, where $\vdash' = \mathbf{C}(\leq)$.*
3. *If $\leq$ satisfies Bounded Disjunction then $\neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta \leq \neg\alpha$ implies $\alpha \vdash' \beta$, where $\vdash' = \mathbf{C}(\leq)$.*

Proof. For Part 1, if $\neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta \not\vdash \alpha$ we get immediately $\alpha \leq' \beta$, by Definition (O). If not, that is $\neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta \vdash \alpha$, then, by And and Right Monotonicity, we have $\neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta \vdash \perp$. Again, by Definition (O), we have $\alpha \leq' \beta$.

For Part 2, assume $\alpha \sim' \beta$. If $\alpha \vdash \beta$. Then we have $\neg\beta \vdash \neg\alpha$, so $\neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta \vdash \neg\alpha$, and hence, by Dominance, $\neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta \sim \neg\alpha$, as desired. If not then there must be $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\gamma \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \beta$ and $\text{neg}\alpha < \gamma$. Therefore $\neg\alpha < \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta$. Now, suppose $\neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta \not\leq \neg\alpha$ towards a contradiction. By Connectivity, we have $\neg\alpha < \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta$ and so, by Conjunctiveness, $\neg\alpha < (\alpha \rightarrow \beta) \vee (\alpha \rightarrow \neg\beta)$. Hence $\neg\alpha < \neg\alpha$, a contradiction to Reflexivity.

For Part 3, if $\neg\alpha < \alpha \rightarrow \beta$ then we immediately have $\alpha \sim' \beta$, by Definition (C). If not, that is $\alpha \rightarrow \beta \leq \neg\alpha$, then applying Bounded Disjunction, we have $\alpha \vee \beta \vee \neg\beta \leq \neg\alpha$. The latter implies $\top \leq \neg\alpha$, so, by Dominance $\gamma \leq \neg\alpha$, for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}$. Hence $\alpha \sim' \beta$, by Definition (C). ■

Theorem 10 *Given a rational ordering $\leq$ and a rational inference relation $\sim$, then $\mathbf{C}(\leq)$ is a rational inference relation and $\mathbf{O}(\sim)$ is a rational ordering. Moreover, we have $\sim = \mathbf{C}(\mathbf{O}(\sim))$ and $\leq = \mathbf{O}(\mathbf{C}(\leq))$.*

Proof. We shall try not to overlap with the proof of Gärdenfors and Makinson proof of Theorem 6 (see proof of Theorem 3.3 in [7]). Therefore we do not cover the case where the second half of condition (R $\sim$) applies. The list of rules we verify is Supraclassicality, Left Logical Equivalence, And, Cut, Cautious Monotony, Or and Rational Monotony. Right Weakening follows from the above list.

We shall first show that $\mathbf{C}(\leq)$ is a rational inference relation.

For Supraclassicality, suppose that $\alpha \vdash \gamma$ but not $\beta \leq \neg\alpha$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$. So there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\neg\alpha < \beta$. But then $\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma$ and therefore $\alpha \sim \gamma$.

For Left Logical Equivalence, suppose that $\alpha \sim \gamma$, $\vdash \alpha \rightarrow \beta$ and $\delta \leq \neg\alpha$ for all $\delta \in \mathcal{L}$. Since $\beta \vdash \alpha$ we have $\neg\alpha \vdash \neg\beta$. By Dominance we get $\neg\alpha \leq \neg\beta$ and by Transitivity $\delta \leq \neg\beta$ for all $\delta \in \mathcal{L}$. Therefore $\beta \sim \gamma$.

For And, suppose that $\alpha \sim \beta$ and $\alpha \sim \gamma$. In case $\delta \leq \neg\alpha$ for all $\delta \in \mathcal{L}$ we have immediately $\alpha \sim \beta \wedge \gamma$.

Turning to Or, suppose that $\alpha \sim \gamma$ and $\beta \sim \gamma$. If $\delta \leq \neg\alpha$ for all $\delta \in \mathcal{L}$ and $\delta \leq \neg\beta$ for all $\delta \in \mathcal{L}$, then by Conjunctiveness we have either $\neg\alpha \leq \neg\alpha \wedge \neg\beta$ or $\neg\beta \leq \neg\alpha \wedge \neg\beta$. In either case $\delta \leq \neg\alpha \wedge \neg\beta$ for all $\delta \in \mathcal{L}$ by Transitivity. Therefore $\neg(\alpha \vee \beta) \sim \gamma$. In the mixed case, say $\delta \leq \neg\alpha$ for all $\delta \in \mathcal{L}$ and there exists $\delta_0 \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\beta \wedge \delta_0 \vdash \gamma$ and $\neg\beta < \delta_0$, we have $(\alpha \vee \beta) \wedge (\neg\alpha \wedge \delta_0) \vdash \gamma$. Now suppose that $\neg\alpha \wedge \delta_0 < \delta_0$. By Conjunctiveness we must have $\delta_0 \leq \neg\alpha \leq \neg\alpha \wedge \delta_0$, a contradiction. Thus $\neg(\alpha \vee \beta) \leq \beta < \delta_0 \leq \neg\alpha \wedge \delta_0$. Therefore $\alpha \vee \beta \sim \gamma$.

For Cut, suppose that $\alpha \sim \beta$ and $\alpha \wedge \beta \sim \gamma$. If $\delta \leq \neg\alpha$ for all $\delta \in \mathcal{L}$ then, by definition, $\alpha \sim \gamma$. If not, there exists $\delta_0 \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\alpha \wedge \delta_0 \vdash \beta$ and $\neg\alpha < \delta_0$. Now suppose that $\delta \leq \neg(\alpha \wedge \gamma)$ for all $\delta \in \mathcal{L}$. Observe that $\alpha \wedge [(\neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta) \wedge \delta_0] \vdash \gamma$. We moreover have that $\neg\alpha < \delta_0 \leq (\neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta) \wedge \delta_0$. Therefore $\alpha \sim \gamma$.

For Rational Monotonicity, suppose that $\alpha \sim \gamma$ and $\alpha \not\sim \neg\beta$. If $\delta \leq \neg\alpha$ for all $\delta \in \mathcal{L}$, then we get a contradiction because $\alpha \sim \neg\beta$.

For Cautious Monotony, suppose that $\alpha \sim \beta$ and $\alpha \sim \gamma$. Observe that in case $\alpha \not\sim \neg\beta$ then the result follows by an application of Rational Monotony. If not, i.e. $\alpha \sim \neg\beta$, then by applying And we have $\alpha \sim \perp$. If $\delta \leq \neg\alpha$ for all δ , then, since $\neg\alpha \vdash \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta$, we have $\delta \leq \neg\alpha \leq \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta$ but $\vdash \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta \rightarrow \neg(\alpha \wedge \beta)$ therefore $\alpha \wedge \beta \sim \gamma$. Otherwise there exists δ such that $\alpha \wedge \delta \vdash \perp$ and $\neg\alpha < \delta$.

But then we have that $\delta \vdash \neg\alpha$ and therefore $\delta \leq \neg\alpha$ which is a contradiction to our hypothesis.

Definition (O) is identical to Gärdenfors and Makinson's one in the second disjunct. Therefore we shall only treat the first disjunct.

For Dominance, suppose $\alpha \vdash \beta$ and $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \vdash \alpha$. We have $\neg\beta \vdash \neg\alpha$ and $\neg\alpha \vdash \neg\alpha$. By Or, we get $\neg\beta \vee \neg\alpha \vdash \neg\alpha$. By Supraclassicality, we have $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \vdash \neg\alpha$. Applying And, we get $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \vdash \perp$.

For Conjunctiveness, suppose $\neg(\alpha \wedge (\alpha \wedge \beta)) \vdash \alpha$ and $\neg(\beta \wedge (\alpha \wedge \beta)) \vdash \beta$. These imply $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \vdash \alpha$ and $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \vdash \beta$, by Left Logical Equivalence. Applying And, we get $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \vdash \alpha \wedge \beta$. By reflexivity of $\vdash$ and And, we have $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \vdash \perp$. By Left Logical Equivalence again, we have $\neg(\alpha \wedge (\alpha \wedge \beta)) \vdash \perp$, and so $\neg(\beta \wedge (\alpha \wedge \beta)) \vdash \perp$, as desired.

For Transitivity, let $\alpha \leq \beta$ and $\beta \leq \gamma$. Suppose $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \vdash \perp$. By Lemma 2.5, we have $\neg\beta \vdash \perp$. Lemma 2.3 gives $\neg(\beta \wedge \gamma) \wedge \neg\beta \vdash \perp$. By S, we have $\neg(\beta \wedge \gamma) \vdash \beta$. So, we have $\neg(\beta \wedge \gamma) \vdash \perp$. Using the initial hypothesis and Or, we get $\neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta \vee \neg\gamma \vdash \perp$. By Lemma 2.5, we have $\neg\alpha \vee \neg\gamma \vdash \perp$, i.e. $\neg(\alpha \wedge \gamma) \vdash \perp$. Now, suppose $\neg(\beta \wedge \gamma) \vdash \perp$ and $\neg(\alpha \wedge \gamma) \not\vdash \alpha$. Then, by Lemma 2.5, we have $\neg\gamma \vdash \perp$. Since $\neg\alpha \vdash \neg\alpha$, we have $\neg\alpha \vee \neg\gamma \vdash \neg\alpha$. Therefore if $\neg(\alpha \wedge \gamma) \vdash \alpha$, then And gives $\neg(\alpha \wedge \gamma) \vdash \perp$.

We shall now show that the initial rational inference relation $\vdash$ and the induced one $\vdash_{\leq}$ by the expectation ordering with (C) are the same.

We show first that $\vdash \subseteq \vdash_{\leq}$. Let $\alpha \vdash \gamma$. We must show that $\alpha \vdash_{\leq} \gamma$. If $\delta \leq \neg\alpha$, for all $\delta \in \mathcal{L}$, then it clearly holds. If not, let $\beta \equiv \neg\alpha \vee \gamma$ then $\vdash \alpha \wedge \beta \leftrightarrow \alpha \wedge \gamma$. So $\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma$. Also, $\alpha \vee \neg\beta \equiv \alpha$. If $\alpha \vdash \perp$ then $\delta \leq \neg\alpha$, for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$ (using Lemma 9.1), so, by our hypothesis, $\alpha \vee \neg\beta \not\vdash \perp$. Observe that $\alpha \vee \neg\beta \vdash \gamma$, and $\gamma \vdash \neg\alpha \vee \gamma \equiv \beta$. Right Weakening gives $\alpha \vee \neg\beta \vdash \beta$. So $\beta \not\leq \neg\alpha$ and therefore $\neg\alpha < \beta$. Hence $\alpha \vdash_{\leq} \gamma$.

For the other direction, i.e. $\vdash_{\leq} \subseteq \vdash$, let $\alpha \vdash_{\leq} \gamma$. Suppose first that $\beta \leq \neg\alpha$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$. Therefore $\top \leq \neg\alpha$. This gives either $\neg(\neg\alpha \wedge \perp) \vdash \perp$ or $\neg(\neg\alpha \wedge \perp) \not\vdash \top$. Since obviously the latter does not hold we must have that $\alpha \vdash \perp$ and hence, by Right Weakening, $\alpha \vdash \gamma$. Now suppose that there exists $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$ with $\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma$ and $\neg\alpha < \beta$, i.e. $\beta \not\leq \neg\alpha$. The latter implies that $\alpha \vee \neg\beta \not\vdash \perp$ and $\alpha \vee \neg\beta \vdash \beta$. Observe that $\alpha \wedge \beta \equiv (\alpha \vee \neg\beta) \wedge \beta$ hence, by Supraclassicality, $(\alpha \vee \neg\beta) \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma$. Applying Cut on the latter and $\alpha \vee \neg\beta \vdash \beta$ we get $\alpha \vee \neg\beta \vdash \gamma$. Applying And on $\alpha \vee \neg\beta \vdash \beta$ and $\alpha \vee \neg\beta \vdash \alpha \vee \neg\beta$ we get $\alpha \vee \neg\beta \vdash \alpha$. Since $\alpha \vee \neg\beta \not\vdash \perp$ we have that $\alpha \vee \neg\beta \not\vdash \neg\alpha$. Applying Rational Monotonicity on the latter and $\alpha \vee \neg\beta \vdash \gamma$ we get $(\alpha \vee \neg\beta) \wedge \alpha \vdash \gamma$, i.e. $\alpha \vdash \gamma$.

It remains to show $\leq = \mathbf{O}(\mathbf{C}(\leq))$. Let $\leq'$ be $\mathbf{O}(\mathbf{C}(\leq))$ and assume $\alpha \leq' \beta$. By definition of $\leq$, we have that $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \vdash \perp$ or $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \not\vdash \alpha$, where $\vdash = \mathbf{C}(\leq)$. The former implies $\gamma \leq \alpha \wedge \beta$, for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}$, by Lemma 9. By Dominance and Transitivity, we have $\alpha \leq \alpha \wedge \beta \leq \beta$, as desired. The latter implies that $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \leq \alpha \wedge \beta$. Since $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \rightarrow \alpha$ is (classically) equivalent to α , we get $\alpha \leq \alpha \wedge \beta$ and so $\alpha \leq \beta$, by Dominance and Transitivity.

For the other direction, assume $\alpha \leq \beta$. If $\gamma \leq \alpha \wedge \beta$, for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}$ then $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \vdash \perp$, by Lemma 9.2, and therefore $\alpha \leq' \beta$, by Definition (O). If not then, by Conjunctiveness on the hypothesis, we have $\alpha \leq \alpha \wedge \beta \leq \beta$. Since

$\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \rightarrow \alpha$ is (classically) equivalent to α , we get $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \rightarrow \alpha \leq \alpha \wedge \beta$. So $\alpha \wedge \beta \not\leq \neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \rightarrow \alpha$ and so, by Definition (C) and Lemma 9.3, we have $\neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) \not\vdash \alpha$. The latter implies, by Definition (O), $\alpha \leq' \beta$, as desired. ■

Proposition 16 *A ranked consequence operator $\vdash$ based on $\vdash$ is induced by a chain of sets of formulas if and only if it is induced by the closure of this chain under arbitrary unions and intersections.*

Proof. Let $\vdash$ and $\vdash'$ be the ranked consequence operators induced by $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ and $\{A_j\}_{j \in J}$ respectively, where the latter is the closure of the former under arbitrary unions and intersections. Without loss of generality we can assume that the sets belonging in $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ carry the same indices in $\{A_j\}_{j \in J}$. We must prove that $\vdash$ is equal to $\vdash'$.

From left to right, suppose $\vdash \beta$ and there exists $i \in I$ such that $\vdash_i \beta$. Since $i \in J$ we also have $\vdash' \beta$. Suppose $\alpha \vdash \beta$. If $\alpha \vdash_i \beta$ for some $i \in I$ then as above $\alpha \vdash' \beta$. If $\vdash_i \neg \alpha$ for all i , i.e. $\neg \alpha \in A_i$ for all i , then $\neg \alpha \in A_j$ for all $j \in J$. For either $A_j = \bigcup_k A_{i_k}$ or $A_j = \bigcap_k A_{i_k}$, where $i_k \in I$, and $\neg \alpha \in A_{i_k}$ for all k .

From right to left, suppose $\vdash' \beta$, then there is $j \in J$ such that $\vdash_j \beta$. Either $A_j = \bigcup_k A_{i_k}$ or $A_j = \bigcap_k A_{i_k}$, where $i_k \in I$. In both cases there is some k_0 such that $\beta \in A_{i_{k_0}}$. Therefore $\vdash \beta$. Suppose now that $\alpha \vdash' \beta$. If there exists $j \in J$ such that $\neg \alpha \notin A_j$ and $\alpha \rightarrow \beta \in A_j$ then either $A_j = \bigcup_k A_{i_k}$ or $A_j = \bigcap_k A_{i_k}$, where $i_k \in I$. In the first case there exists k_0 such that $\alpha \rightarrow \beta \in A_{i_{k_0}}$. We also have that $\neg \alpha \notin A_{i_k}$ for all k . So for the same k_0 we have that $\neg \alpha \notin A_{i_{k_0}}$. Therefore $\alpha \vdash \beta$. In the second case we have that $\alpha \rightarrow \beta \in A_{i_k}$ for all k while there exists k_0 such that $\neg \alpha \in A_{i_{k_0}}$. If $\neg \alpha \in A_j$ for all $j \in J$, then we immediately have that $\neg \alpha \in A_i$ for all $i \in I$ and hence $\alpha \vdash \beta$. ■

Proposition 19 *An ordering induced by a ranked consequence operator is rational.*

Proof. Let $\langle \{B_i\}_{i \in I}, \vdash \rangle$ be a ranked consequence operator. Denote $\mathbf{O}(\vdash)$ with $\leq$, and $\mathbf{C}(\leq)$ with $\vdash \leq$.

We should verify that $\leq$ satisfies Supraclassicality, Transitivity, and Conjunctiveness.

For Supraclassicality, suppose $\alpha \vdash \beta$. We have $\vdash \alpha \rightarrow \beta$, so if $B_i \vdash \alpha$ then $B_i \vdash \beta$, for all $i \in I$. Hence $\alpha \leq \beta$.

For Transitivity, suppose $\alpha \leq \beta$ and $\beta \leq \gamma$. Pick an $i \in I$ such that $B_i \vdash \alpha$. We have $B_i \vdash \beta$, since $\alpha \leq \beta$. Hence $B_i \vdash \gamma$, since $\beta \leq \gamma$, as desired.

For Conjunctiveness, suppose $\alpha \not\leq \alpha \wedge \beta$ and $\beta \not\leq \alpha \wedge \beta$, towards a contradiction. By our assumptions, there exist B_i and B_j with $i, j \in J$ such that $B_i \vdash \alpha$ and $B_i \not\vdash \alpha \wedge \beta$ and $B_j \vdash \beta$ and $B_j \not\vdash \alpha \wedge \beta$. Now, B_i 's form a chain under inclusion, so either $B_j \subseteq B_i$, or $B_i \subseteq B_j$. If $B_j \subseteq B_i$ then $B_i \vdash \beta$, a contradiction, since $B_i \vdash \alpha$ and $B_i \not\vdash \alpha \wedge \beta$. Similarly, for $B_i \subseteq B_j$.

We must now show that $\alpha \vdash \beta$ iff $\alpha \vdash \leq \beta$. Assume $\alpha \vdash \beta$. We have either $\vdash_i \neg \alpha$, for all $i \in I$, or there exists $i \in I$ such that $B_i \not\vdash \neg \alpha$ and $B_i \vdash \alpha \rightarrow \beta$. Assume the former. We have immediately $\gamma \leq \neg \alpha$, for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{L}$. Hence $\alpha \vdash \leq$,

by Lemma 9.2. Assume the latter, then $\alpha \rightarrow \beta \not\leq \neg\alpha$, that is, $\neg\alpha < \alpha \rightarrow \beta$. Hence $\alpha \vdash \beta$, by Lemma 9.3. The other direction is similar. ■

Corollary 20 *A ranked consequence operator is a rational inference relation.*

Proof. We shall give an alternative proof with a straightforward verification of the rules of rational inference. We shall show that a ranked consequence operator $\vdash$ based on $\vdash$ induced by a chain of sets $\{B_i\}_{i \in I}$ satisfies Supraclassicality, Left Logical Equivalence, Right Weakening, And, Cut, Cautious Monotonicity, Or and Rational Monotonicity.

For Supraclassicality, suppose $\alpha \vdash \beta$. We have either $\vdash_i \neg\alpha$ for all $i \in I$ or there exists some $i \in I$ such that $\not\vdash_i \neg\alpha$. In the first case we have immediately $\alpha \vdash \beta$. In the second case we have that $B_i, \alpha \vdash \beta$, by our hypothesis, and therefore $\alpha \vdash \beta$.

For Left Logical Equivalence, suppose that $\vdash \alpha \equiv \beta$ and $\alpha \vdash \gamma$. We have either $\vdash_i \neg\alpha$, i.e. $B_i \vdash \neg\alpha$, for all $i \in I$ or there exists some $i \in I$ such that $\not\vdash_i \neg\alpha$ and $B_i, \alpha \vdash \gamma$. Since α and β are equivalent under $\vdash$, we have in the first case that $B_i \vdash \neg\beta$ for all $i \in I$ and in the second case that there exists some $i \in I$ such that $\not\vdash_i \neg\beta$ and $B_i, \beta \vdash \gamma$. In both cases we have $\beta \vdash \gamma$.

For Right weakening, suppose $\alpha \vdash \beta$ and $\vdash \beta \rightarrow \gamma$. If $\vdash_i \neg\alpha$ for all $i \in I$ then we immediately get $\alpha \vdash \gamma$. If there exists $i \in I$ such that $\not\vdash_i \neg\alpha$ and $B_i, \alpha \vdash \beta$ then we also have that $B_i, \alpha \vdash \beta \rightarrow \gamma$ by hypothesis. Therefore $B_i, \alpha \vdash \gamma$ and $\alpha \vdash \gamma$.

For And, suppose $\alpha \vdash \beta$ and $\alpha \vdash \gamma$. If $\vdash_i \neg\alpha$ for all $i \in I$ then we immediately have $\alpha \vdash \beta \wedge \gamma$. If not then there exists $i, k \in I$ such that $\not\vdash_i \neg\alpha$, $\not\vdash_k \neg\alpha$, $B_i, \alpha \vdash \beta$, and $B_k, \alpha \vdash \gamma$. Since $\leq$ is linear let $i \leq k$. Then $B_i \subseteq B_k$ and therefore $B_k, \alpha \vdash \beta$. So $B_k, \alpha \vdash \beta \wedge \gamma$ and $\alpha \vdash \beta \wedge \gamma$.

For Cut, suppose $\alpha \vdash \beta$ and $\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma$. If $\vdash_i \neg\alpha$ for all $i \in I$ then we immediately have $\alpha \vdash \gamma$. If not, then there exists $i \in I$ such that $\not\vdash_i \neg\alpha$ and $B_i, \alpha \vdash \beta$. If $\vdash_j \neg(\alpha \wedge \beta) (\equiv \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta)$ for all $j \in I$, then for i , $B_i \vdash \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta$, i.e. $B_i, \alpha \vdash \neg\beta$. Combining with our hypothesis we get $B_i \vdash \neg\alpha$, i.e. $\vdash_i \neg\alpha$, a contradiction. Therefore there exists $k \in I$ such that $\not\vdash_k \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta$ and $B_k, \alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma$. There are two cases: either $k \leq i$ or $i \leq k$. In the first case we have $B_i, \alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma$ as well, so by (regular) cut on $\vdash$ and our hypothesis we get $B_i, \alpha \vdash \gamma$. Therefore $\alpha \vdash \gamma$. In the second case, observe that $B_k, \alpha \vdash \beta$ so as above $B_k, \alpha \vdash \gamma$. Since $B_k \not\vdash \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta$ then $B_k \not\vdash \neg\alpha$ so again $\alpha \vdash \gamma$.

For Cautious Monotony, suppose $\alpha \vdash \beta$ and $\alpha \vdash \gamma$. If $\vdash_i \neg\alpha$ for all $i \in I$ then we also have $\vdash_i \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta$ hence $\vdash_i \neg(\alpha \wedge \beta)$ for all $i \in I$. Therefore $\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma$. If not, there exists $i, k \in I$ such that $\not\vdash_i \neg\alpha$, $B_i, \alpha \vdash \beta$, $\not\vdash_j \neg\alpha$ and $B_j, \alpha \vdash \gamma$. Let $l = \max(i, k)$ then $B_l \not\vdash \neg\alpha$ and both $B_l, \alpha \vdash \beta$ and $B_l, \alpha \vdash \gamma$. From the latter we get $B_l, \alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma$. Suppose that $B_l \vdash \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta$ then $B_l, \alpha \vdash \neg\beta$. Combining it with above we get $B_l \vdash \neg\alpha$ which is a contradiction to our hypothesis.

For Or, suppose that $\alpha \vdash \gamma$ and $\beta \vdash \gamma$. If both $\vdash_i \neg\alpha$ and $\vdash_i \neg\beta$ for all $i \in I$ then we also have $\vdash_i \neg\alpha \wedge \neg\beta$ for all i and therefore $\alpha \vee \beta \vdash \gamma$. If this is true for only one of them, say $\vdash_i \neg\alpha$ for all $i \in I$ but there exists $k \in I$ such that $\not\vdash_k \neg\beta$ and $B_k, \beta \vdash \gamma$, then we also have $\not\vdash_k \neg\beta \wedge \neg\alpha$ and B_k which implies

$B_k, \alpha \vdash \gamma$. So $B_k, \alpha \vee \beta \vdash \gamma$ and therefore $\alpha \vee \beta \vdash \gamma$. If neither of them holds then there exist $i, k \in I$ such that $\not\vdash_i \neg\alpha$, $B_i, \alpha \vdash \gamma$, $\not\vdash_k \neg\beta$ and $B_k, \beta \vdash \gamma$. Let $l = \max(i, k)$ then we have $\not\vdash_l \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta$, $B_l, \alpha \vdash \gamma$ and $B_l, \beta \vdash \gamma$. So $B_l, \alpha \vee \beta \vdash \gamma$ and therefore $\alpha \vee \beta \vdash \gamma$.

For Rational Monotonicity, suppose that $\alpha \not\vdash \neg\beta$ and $\alpha \vdash \gamma$. We can't have $\vdash_i \neg\alpha$ for all $i \in I$ because we have that $\alpha \not\vdash \neg\beta$. So there exists $i \in I$ such that $\not\vdash_i \neg\alpha$ and $B_i, \alpha \vdash \gamma$. We have by monotonicity of $\vdash$ that $B_i, \alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma$. Now observe that $\alpha \not\vdash \neg\beta$ implies that if $B_i, \alpha \vdash \neg\beta$ then $\vdash_i \neg\alpha$. However since $\not\vdash_i \neg\alpha$ we have that $B_i, \alpha \not\vdash \neg\beta$ so $B_i \not\vdash \neg\alpha \vee \neg\beta$. Therefore $\alpha \wedge \beta \vdash \gamma$ by definition. ■

Theorem 21 *A rational inference relation is a ranked consequence operator.*

Proof. Denote the comparative rational inference relation by $\vdash_{\leq}$. We shall define a chain of sets $\{A_i\}_{i \in I}$ which generates a ranked consequence operator $\vdash$ equal to $\vdash_{\leq}$. Let $\sim$ be the equivalence relation induced by $\leq$ (an expectation ordering is clearly a preorder). The equivalence classes will be denoted by $\hat{\alpha}$ (where $\alpha \in \hat{\alpha}$). It is also clear that the set of equivalence classes is linearly ordered. Now, for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{L}$, let

$$A_{\hat{\alpha}} = \{\beta : \alpha \leq \beta\}.$$

Note here that, by Dominance, the sets $A_{\hat{\alpha}}$ are closed under consequence. Moreover, we have $A_{\hat{\alpha}} \subseteq A_{\hat{\beta}}$ iff $\beta \leq \alpha$. Now, generate a ranked consequence operator $\vdash$ as in Definition 4.

We must show that $\vdash$ and $\vdash_{\leq}$ are identical.

Let $\alpha \vdash_{\leq} \beta$, i.e. either $\beta \leq \neg\alpha$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$, or there exists $\delta \in \mathcal{L}$ such that $\neg\alpha < \delta$ and $\delta \wedge \alpha \vdash \gamma$. In the first case $\neg\alpha \in A_{\hat{\beta}}$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$. So $\vdash_{\hat{\beta}} \neg\alpha$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$ and therefore $\alpha \vdash \gamma$. In the second case consider $A_{\hat{\delta}}$. We have $\delta \in A_{\hat{\delta}}$ so $A_{\hat{\delta}}, \alpha \vdash \gamma$. Suppose that $A_{\hat{\delta}} \vdash \neg\alpha$ then by compactness there exists $\delta' \in A_{\hat{\delta}}$ such that $\delta' \vdash \neg\alpha$. By Dominance we have $\delta' \leq \neg\alpha$ and by definition of $A_{\hat{\delta}}$, $\delta \leq \delta'$, i.e. $\delta \leq \neg\alpha$, a contradiction.

Now let $\alpha \vdash \gamma$. If $\vdash_{\hat{\beta}} \neg\alpha$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$ then $\beta \leq \neg\alpha$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{L}$ and we are done. If not, then there exists $\hat{\delta}$ such that $A_{\hat{\delta}} \not\vdash \neg\alpha$ and $A_{\hat{\delta}}, \alpha \vdash \gamma$. Since $A_{\hat{\delta}} \not\vdash \neg\alpha$ we must have $\neg\alpha < \delta$. By compactness there exists $\delta' \in A_{\hat{\delta}}$ such that $\delta', \alpha \vdash \gamma$, i.e. $\delta' \wedge \alpha \vdash \gamma$ and $\neg\alpha < \delta \leq \delta'$. Therefore $\alpha \vdash \gamma$. ■